	Case5:10-cr-00729-JW Document27	7 Filed04/13/11 Page1 of 2	
1	Donald E. J. Kilmer, Jr. (SBN: 179986) Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC		
2	1645 Willow Street, Suite 150 San Jose, California 95125 Phone: (408) 264-8489		
3			
4	Fax: (408) 264-8487 E-Mail: Don@DKLawOffice.com		
5	Attorney for Defendant:		
6	STEVEŇ VARGEM		
7			
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN JOS	SE DIVISION	
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO.: CR 10-00729 JW	
12	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO STRIKE:	
13	V.	CLETS PRINT OUT (Doc # 24-3)	
14		F.R.E. 802, 901/902	
15	STEVEN LEE VARGEM,		
16	Defendant.		
17	STATEMENT OF FACTS		
18	1. The Government submitted, as Exhibit 3 (Doc # 24-3), what appears to be a		
19	CLETS printout showing information about Defendant VARGEM.		
20	2. The document appears to have been generated on June 24, 2010.		
21	STATEMENT OF LAW		
22	3. Federal Rule of Evidence 802 generally precludes the consideration of		
23	evidence that is defined as hearsay.		
24	4. Federal Rules of Evidence 901/902 set up the rules for the admissibility of		
25	documents that are not authenticated by a witness giving live testimony.		
26	Argument Conclusion		
27	5. If the Government is going to present Officer Tuell as a witness at the		
28	hearing in this matter, subject to cross examination by the Defense and a		
	D 1.60		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	ŀ
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

credibility assessment by the Court, and Officer Tuell can authenticate Document 24-3, then this document might be helpful to the Court if the document is otherwise admissible under the F.R.E. As it stands now, it does not qualify for authentication under any of the general provisions of F.R.E. 901, nor does is it self-authenticating under F.R.E. 902. This document is subject to a motion to strike.

6. Additionally, the document itself is hearsay by any definition. It does not fit any of the hearsay exceptions under the rules of evidence. And its bare submission without live testimony deprives the Defendant of the right of cross examination in violation the "confrontation clause" of the Sixth Amendment to Constitution. Document 24-3 is subject to a motion to strike under F.R.E. 801/802/805.

Respectfully Submitted on April 12, 2011.

/s/ Donald Kilmer

Attorney for Defendant Steven Vargem